



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,636	02/21/2001	Eric Andrew Knopf	ARC920000017US1	8586

26381 7590 06/03/2003
LACASSE & ASSOCIATES, LLC
1725 DUKE STREET
SUITE 650
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

LEWIS, DAVID LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

6

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

54

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/788,636

Applicant(s)
Knopf

Examiner
David L. Lewis

Art Unit
2673



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 13, 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-7, 9-15, 17-33, and 43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 43 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-7, 9-15, and 17-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. **Claim 43** allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claims 5-7 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5-7 depend on canceled claim 4. Claim 25 recites "along said exterior side", wherein "exterior side" lacks antecedent basis. Insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-15, and 17-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latocha et al. in view of Ohgami et al. (5574625).**
6. **As in clam 1, Latocha et al. teaches of a portable computer display device including one or more mating sections for docking with similar portable computer display devices, figure 3a, column 3 lines 23-30, said display device comprising: a computer display with associated supporting cabinet structure, figure 3a, column 1 lines 42-67, column 2 lines 23-30, said supporting cabinet additionally comprising one or more structural connectors for structurally mating to said similar device, figure 3a; at least one electrical connector disposed within said associated supporting cabinet structure and proximate to said one or more exterior sides, said at least one electrical connector capable of connecting in a mating relationship with a corresponding electrical connector in said similar portable display device, said one or more exposed display edges abutting in a substantially coplanar configuration to a corresponding exposed display edge of said second similar portable device when said electrical connectors are connected and said computer display logically re-mapped to be part of a single display comprising the displays of both devices, figure 3a, column 2 lines 1-25, column 4 lines 3-12. Wherein Latocha et al. teaches of PDA being adapted with a mating male and female plug device on the side of said device, wherein the two PDA devices combine to form a larger working space, made out of the combined displays, wherein the computer software allows the PDA's to share information and drives the displays as one display area. However Latocha is silent as to teaching said associated supporting cabinet structure having one or more movable exterior sides where one or more corresponding edges of said display are selectively exposed, said edges exposed by removing or temporarily displacing one or more of said movable exterior sides which protect said**

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

one or more exposed display edges. The idea of protecting computer mating or docking ports from physical damage with a selective port cover is well known in the art. **Ohgami et al. teaches of a** portable information processing apparatus having multiple port covers for selectively exposing said ports, **figure 7 item 22**, wherein as is well known a cover is adopted to cover the port when not in use, for the purpose of protecting the port from physical damage. Latocha teaches modular displays, conventionally of the type suggested by Ohgami, and it would therefore make good design choice to adapt the device of Latocha with selective port covers as taught by Ohgami to protect the ports while not in use, from physical damage. The know means to protect the port from physical damage is suggested by the obvious teachings of Ohgami. **It would have therefore been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify the device of Latocha to include a movable port cover as suggested by Ohgami, for purposes of covering the port/plug when not in use, from physical damage, as is commonly know in such portable devices, as found in claim 1.**

7. **As in claims 14, Latocha et al. teaches of a portable computing device including a display having a display surface, said device capable of being mated with a similar device such that the display surfaces of each device functionally form a single display surface, figure 3a, column 2 lines 1-15, said device comprising: a housing having a top surface enclosing said display, figure 3a, a bottom support surface and a plurality of side surfaces connecting said top surface and said bottom support surface, figure 3a; said plurality of said side surfaces comprising one or more fixed surfaces, figure 3a, column 2 lines 1-15, column 3 lines 25-35, column 4 lines 5-15. However Latoch is silent as to teaching one or more movable surfaces, and wherein when movable surfaces are moved, said device is receptive to being physically mated in a substantially coplanar fashion to said similar device as to form said single display. The idea of protecting computer mating or docking ports from physical damage with a selective port cover is well known in the art. Ohgami et al. teaches of a portable information processing apparatus having multiple port covers for selectively exposing said ports,**

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

figure 7 item 22, wherein as is well known a cover is adopted to cover the port when not in use, for the purpose of protecting the port from physical damage. Latocha teaches modular displays, conventionally of the type suggested by Ohgami, and it would therefore make good design choice to adapt the device of Latocha with selective port covers as taught by Ohgami to protect the ports while not in use, from physical damage. The know means to protect the port from physical damage is suggested by the obvious teachings of Ohgami. **It would have therefore been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify the device of Latocha to include a movable port cover as suggested by Ohgami, for purposes of covering the port/plug when not in use, from physical damage, as is commonly known in such portable devices, as found in claim 14.**

8. **As in claim 25, Latocha et al. teaches of a portable computer display device including one or more mating sections for docking with similar portable computer display devices, figure 3a**, said display device comprising: a computer display with associated supporting cabinet structure having a display surface, **figure 3a**; at least one electrical connector disposed within said side section along said edge, **figure 3a**; at least one physical mating element disposed on said cabinet along said exterior side, **figure 3a**; wherein said electrical connector and mating element are disposed such that when said device is docked with a second similar portable display device via a mating electrical connector and a mating element disposed along a side of said second device having a corresponding exposed display edge, said display edges are substantially contiguous and the display surfaces of said devices are substantially coplanar, **figure 3a, column 5 lines 48-67. However Latocha is silent as to teaching** said associated supporting cabinet structure having one or more movable side sections where a corresponding edge of said display is selectively exposed by displacing a movable side section. The idea of protecting computer mating or docking ports from physical damage with a selective port cover is well known in the art. **Ohgami et al. teaches of a portable information processing apparatus having multiple port covers for selectively exposing said ports, figure 7 item 22**, wherein

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

as is well known a cover is adopted to cover the port when not in use, for the purpose of protecting the port from physical damage. Latocha teaches modular displays, conventionally of the type suggested by Ohgami, and it would therefore make good design choice to adapt the device of Latocha with selective port covers as taught by Ohgami to protect the ports while not in use, from physical damage. The know means to protect the port from physical damage is suggested by the obvious teachings of Ohgami. **It would have therefore been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify the device of Latocha to include a movable port cover as suggested by Ohgami, for purposes of covering the port/plug when not in use, from physical damage, as is commonly known in such portable devices, as found in claim 25.**

9. **As in claims 26, Latocha et al. teaches of** wherein said computer display is logically re-mapped when connected to said second similar portable computer display device to be part of a single display comprising the displays of both devices, column 1 lines 60-67, column 3 lines 25-35. **As in claims 3 and 27, Latocha et al. teaches of** wherein said portable computer display device shares processing power when connected to said similar portable computer display device, column 3 lines 15-35. **As in claim 5, Latocha et al. teaches of a** wherein said display is substantially rectangular in shape and a first one of said two exterior sides extends along a length of said display while a second one of said two exterior edges extends along a width of said display, figure 2b. **As in claims 6 and 28, Latocha et al. teaches of** wherein said portable display device is connected to said similar portable display device along said first one of said two exterior sides providing a portrait orientation display, figure 1a-f. **As in claims 7 and 29, Latocha et al. teaches of** wherein said portable display device is connected to said similar portable display device along said second one of said two exterior sides providing a landscape orientation display, figure 1b. **As in claims 11 and 33, Latocha et al. teaches of** wherein data processed by said connected devices is synchronized prior to disconnection of said devices, column 1 lines 61-67. **As in claim 12, Latocha et al. teaches of** wherein said device further

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

comprises one or more structural connectors for structurally mating said device to said similar device, figure 1c and 3a. **As in claim 13**, Latocha et al. teaches of wherein said device abuts in a substantially coplanar configuration, figure 3a,b.

10. **As in claim 15**, Latocha et al. teaches of remapping the displays into a single display, column 1 lines 60-67, column 3 lines 25-35. **As in claims 17-20**, Latocha et al. teaches of said mating plug being on a plurality of sides, and therefore it would also be obvious to have movable port covers on a plurality of sides, as suggested by Ohgami et al., making it possible to assume the portrait or landscape orientations. **As in claims 21-23**, Ohgami et al. teaches of said removable, foldible, hinged port cover, figure 2 items 22 and 32, wherein it would have been obvious to allow access to the ports of Latocha et al., given the well known port cover usage. **As in claim 24**, Latocha et al. teaches of said device synchronized data by said mated devices prior to disconnection, column 1 lines 60-67, column 2 lines 1-15. **As in claims 9-10 and 30-32**, Latocha in view of Ohgami et al. teaches of said removable, foldible, hinged port cover, figure 2 items 22 and 32, wherein it would have been obvious to allow access to the ports of Latocha et al., given the well known port cover usage.

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/13/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Latocha in view of Ohgami et al, teaches of matable device comprising a selectibly movable mate port cover. It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify the device of Latocha to include a movable port cover as suggested by Ohgami, for purposes of covering the port/plug when not in use, potecting it from physical damage, as is commonly know in such portable devices. Latocha teaches of coplanar abutment of one or more like devices, to form a single sceen. Adapting a cover for the mate ports on the device of Latocha for the purpose of protecting the mate ports from physical damage would produce the device as claimed. The motivation for covering computer ports is taken from Ohgami. The abutment of like matable devices in coplanar fashion is taken from Latocha. The Applicant's addition of a movable port cover to the invention of Latocha, as claimed, would have been obvious to the skilled artisan. Rejection maintained.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Serial Number: 09/788,636
Art Unit: 2673
Applicant: Knopf

Page 9

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **David L. Lewis** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-3026**. The examiner can normally be reached on MT and THF from 8 to 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached on (703) 305-4938. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Serial Number: 09/788,636

Art Unit: 2673

Applicant: Knopf

Page 10

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.


Amare Mengistu
Primary Examiner

Examiner: David L. Lewis

May 31, 2003